



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

have tried to illustrate this belief by showing how Christian morality deals with suggestions which are being discussed in quiet corners and with bated breath, as well as with the proposals of more vehement agitators.

“*But, after all, is this guide to be trusted? Is the Christian faith tenable by thinking men to-day? Can it hold its ground firmly and not be forced to retreat as empirical science advances? Are not more spiritual faiths maintained in the East? Is there not a less debatable faith in humanity?*” I have tried to illustrate some of the reasons for believing that the Christian faith is trustworthy, by examining attacks which were made upon it long ago, as well as the claims of its latest rival.

“*At least is it not discredited by the divisions among professing Christians and by the ‘insubordination’ of some of the clergy?*” To me at least it does not seem that these things justify us in neglecting its teaching, and I have exemplified my opinions by taking one or two prominent instances.”

The following are the titles of some of the more interesting essays: “Marriage and Population,” “Socialism,” “The Ethics of Money Investment” (originally a lecture to the Ethical Society in London), “Positivism: its Truth and its Fallacies,” and “The Unitarians.” Dr. Cunningham nearly always succeeds in making his point of view perfectly clear, and his point of view is nearly always one for which there is a good deal to be said. Even those who are unable to accept his fundamental position can hardly fail to be interested and instructed by his remarks.

J. S. M.

MODERN HUMANISTS. By John M. Robertson. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1891. Pp. vi., 275.

This book consists of an interesting series of lectures on Carlyle, Mill, Emerson, Matthew Arnold, Ruskin, and Herbert Spencer, regarded as humanists or critics of life. Mr. Robertson's own attitude might be pretty well summed up in Shelley's line *Εἰμι φιλόανθρωπος, δημοκράτικός τ' ἄθεος τε*. He writes from the point of view of a materialistic evolutionist. Hence his treatment of Mr. Herbert Spencer is naturally more sympathetic than that of most of the others. On all of them, however, he occasionally makes penetrating observations. To Carlyle he is perhaps least fair. In one passage he refers to him as “gnashing his teeth, this raucous prophet, hooting like a Yahoo, snarling like a beast of prey.” Such language is evidently not a criticism of Carlyle, but rather of Mr. John M. Robertson. On Mill he has some keen criticisms to make, especially on his defence of Theism. The essay on Emerson seems to me specially appreciative and searching. He well says of him that “he is the very poet of optimism, which it is not an easy thing to be: prosperity is prosaic, and the poetic impulse turns most spontaneously to shadow. It is his glory, and a glory not easily won, to have convinced men that every age must find its highest inspiration in itself, if it is ever to be capable of giving inspiration to others.” He is severe on Matthew Arnold. “Righteousness and truth!” he exclaims, “yes, in the name of humanity, let us have them: the world is perishing for lack of them. But what are righteousness and truth; and how are we to determine what deserves to be of good report? If ‘whatsoever things are honest’ is to include the Tarpeian Rock and the lash for men exasperated into transient riot by tyrannous

denial of their ancient rights, what is the worth of the air of benignity and the sanctified intonation? If truth is to mean inspired mistranslation and the systematic falsifying of religious history in the interests of sentiment; and if righteousness is to mean the cold-blooded urging of iniquitous wars in the name of national prestige, what better is all this mellifluous morality than the tender mercies of the wicked?" Towards Ruskin, he is much more sympathetic. He says of him, in comparison with Carlyle, that "his preparation, in the close study of relations in the department of æsthetics, seems to give him an abnormal power of seeing and representing in groups and masses the connections of our industrial life, which Carlyle only saw under a few ethical headings, though he, too, had the pictorial eye. Carlyle at bottom is Puritan, is always running into ethical metaphor, where Ruskin, tingling under a primary æsthetic stimulus, gives us in a flash the actual facts. Thus he is in these matters by far the more 'inevitable' critic, to use Wordsworth's phrase." He has to add, however, that "Ruskin is, so far as my reading goes, the most self-contradictory writer who ever lived," and that "for want of patience and temper, and, alas! want of continuous sanity, he has set against him alike economists, artists, democrats, rationalists, scientists; and the luxury of all-round vituperation is dearly bought at that price by a man who wants to make proselytes." The concluding essay is on Mr. Herbert Spencer, whom Mr. Robertson apostrophizes as his "spiritual Father and honored Master." In the midst of his laudations, however, he admits that Mr. Spencer "is not a born metaphysician: he has not that alertness of insight into the intricacies of language which enables a thinker in general to avoid fallacy and carry forward the processes of mental analysis." And indeed he points out so many fallacies in Mr. Spencer's reasonings, that one wonders a little at his persistent admiration. In his view of society, he definitely throws off Mr. Spencer's guidance, and criticises him very much in the spirit of Mr. Ritchie's "Principles of State Interference." He has some pointed remarks also on Mr. Spencer's view of religion.

On the whole the volume, though not containing anything very original, is one of considerable interest. The style is somewhat slipshod, and perhaps sometimes a little stilted. Carlyle and Ruskin, it seems, have not "patience to *expiscate* a general truth." His materialism, too, comes out rather crudely at times; as when he says that "men's minds are the outcome of their bodies, which are more or less extensive modifications of the bodies of their parents or ancestors." And his "Epilogue," in which his own views on social reform are given, does not appear to the present reviewer to be a very enlightening contribution to the subject. But the critical notices may be commended to the attention of all who are interested in our modern humanists. They are always vigorous and stimulating, and sometimes penetrating and original.

J. S. MACKENZIE.

BROWNING AS A PHILOSOPHICAL AND RELIGIOUS TEACHER. By Henry Jones, M.A., Professor of Philosophy in the University College of North Wales. Glasgow: James MacLehose and Sons, 1891. Pp. xii., 367.

This book is not a series of disconnected studies; its object is rather to explain and enforce a very definite view regarding the position of Browning as a philo-